Mutual Interest of the Farmer and Manufacturer.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CAREY A. TRIMBLE, OF OHIO.

Delivered in the U. S. House of Representatives, May 5, 1860.

The House being in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. TRIMBLE said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The tariff bill, introduced by Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee of Ways and Means, and now under discussion in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, I regard as one of the most important measures to be considered by the present Congress. This opinion may be influenced, in some measure, by the interest which is felt in the subject by the constituents I represent; yet the tariff has always been regarded as a question affecting more generally than any other the material interests of the country. At the very threshold of the great experiment of free government, instituted by our fathers, it assumed an importance which we, at this day, can scarcely realize. The Constitution made it the duty of Congress to provide revenue for the support of the Government. How to do this, how to pay off the revolutionary debt, and provide also for the future defence of the country, was certainly, in the then feeble and impoverished condition of the colonies, a very grave question. Upon its decision might depend the fate of the Government itself. That foresight and wisdom which had brought to successful issue all of the plans of the great men of that period led to the adoption of the tariff system. This mode of raising revenue was recommended by various considerations; but the most weighty of them all was that of giving protection and encouragement to their infant manufactures and commerce.

It had been the policy of the mother country to discourage and interdict every species of manufacturing, and to monopolize the commerce and carrying trade of all her colonies. So rigidly had this policy been enforced, that the people found themselves, after the Revolution, destitute of vessels for carrying on trade, and of facilities for manufacturing the common articles of necessity. Their experience under this system had taught them that the production of raw materials in the richest abundance which a bountiful soil could supply, added nothing to their prosperity or wealth, so long as more than one-half the value of these materials was consumed in their shipment and in their manufacture by foreign nations. To prevent this loss to the producer, diversify the labor of the people, stimulate enterprise, and develop the yet hidden resources of the country, were objects which our fathers had the wisdom to foresee could only be accomplished by building up a commerce and establishing manufactories of their own. They further foresaw that their independence could be made complete and permanent only by throwing off every sort of vassalage to all foreign Powers. The policy of raising revenue by taxing foreign goods was therefore adopted. Its efficiency has been amply vindicated by the results.

The history of the embarrassments and early struggles of our Government must convince any one that it could not have been sustained under a system of direct taxation. The want of money, and the continuance of commercial dependence upon England, as a necessary consequence of direct taxation, must have greatly increased the distress of the people, if it had not caused the abandonment of the great experiment which they had struggled through a seven years' war to inaugurate. It might have been recorded, as the fate of their Government, that "its years were few, and full of trouble." But, sir, under this policy it lived, sustained itself through the trials and perils of another war with England, and in its progress demonstrated the fact, verified by the experience of all other nations, that the only road to wealth and independence and power was in protecting home labor and capital against foreign labor and capital.

This mode of raising revenue, adopted by our fathers, is still preserved; and though frequent

changes have been made in our tariff laws, and unjust discriminations sometimes permitted against particular branches of industry, yet the principle of protection has never been wholly abandoned. And now, after the lapse of more than seventy years, when our borders have been extended from the Atlantic seaboard to the Pacific, and our productions have greatly multiplied, and our population and wealth grown to the proportions of a mighty nation, we find this policy as perfectly adapted to our condition and wants as it was in the infancy of our Government. To some branches of our national industry encouragement to the same extent is not now needed; but the principle of discriminating by our tariff laws in favor of the labor and enterprise and capital of our own people, is no less just and wise now, than at any former period of our history.

England and France, the most enlightened of nations, have more fully demonstrated than any others that the strength of a State, and the prosperity of a people, are best secured by diversifying and protecting labor. The tariff laws and statistical tables of England will show with what pertinacity and regularity she has adhered to this policy; and they will also reveal the secret of her rapid march to the proud position she now holds as the first commercial and manufacturing Power of the world. The extent of her commerce, the vast exports of her manufactures, and the exhibitions of her wealth and power in the last few years, have excited the wonder and admiration of the world. And yet her achievements in the Crimean and Indian wars, upon the land and upon the sea, appear less wonderful than the slight effect which their immense sacrifices of life and treasure seemed to produce on her credit or the prosperity of the country. Any other nation must have been exhausted and crippled by such a wasteful contest; but the secret was, the work in her mines went on; the furnaces, the potteries, the cotton and other factories, were busy supplying the waste of the war by the profits of their handiwork; and her merchant ships still rode over the oceans in the race for the commerce of the world; and, when the wars were ended, she found herself rich and strong as before.

I must think, Mr. Chairman, that the same policy, steadily maintained in this country, would have been attended with similar results. The want of capital and cheap labor and low interest would have been balanced by having the raw materials on the spot, cheap food for our artisans, and a home market. And if, instead of seeking a foreign market, we had encouraged the manufacture of our own materials, so as to have kept pace with their increased production, who can doubt that we would have been to-day more nearly the equal of England in all the elements of greatness and strength? We smile at the simplicity of our German ancestors, who brought brick from Holland, with which to build their houses; our children may smile at our much greater folly, of building railroads to Pennsylvania mines with *English iron*, and paying the British $10,000,000 per year for manufacturing the cotton cloth we use.

I know, sir, that parties, and individuals in the same party, both in this country and elsewhere, have differed in opinion on the abstract theories of protection and free trade; but I also know that, whilst, in other countries than our own, political economists have been discussing theories, the Governments have always practiced protection. Our country is almost the only exception; and, sir, it must be regarded as most remarkable, that any party in this country should have men more inclined to listen to the abstractions of theorists, and the suggestions of the paid emissaries of England, than to the lessons of experience taught by all nations. And, yet more remarkable, after all the attempts which have been made in this country at an approach to free trade, by lowering duties and increasing importations, have resulted only in diminishing revenue, as well as in draining the country of its gold and silver, robbing the mechanic of employment and the farmer of his market, that any one should still be found to advocate it. Sir, it is a *burlesque* to talk about free trade in this country, when every other Government on the face of the earth is practicing protection. When some other plausible practicable mode of meeting the vast expenditures of the Government is presented, and the time shall arrive (if it ever does) in the history of the world, when all nations are prepared, in their commercial relations, to place each other on a perfect equality, it will then be time to talk of free trade. Count De Morny, President of the French Legislatif Corps, in a speech explanatory of the late commercial treaty between England and France, said:

"Free trade may, it appears to me, be con-
' sidered as the object to which society is tend-
' ing, but protection ought to be the means of
' arriving at it. Suppose free trade established
' in a new and poor country, what will that
' country produce? I do not deny but that it
' can develop some favored industry by a natu-
' ral privileged situation, but foreign competi-
' tion would stifle in their bud all those things
' which it requires in order to prosper—capital,
' skillful workmen, experienced overseers, easy
' communication, and a good market—in fact,
' all the conditions which time alone can give.
' A transition, consequently, is indispensable;
' and to preach free trade to a country which
' does not enjoy all these advantages, is nearly
' as equitable as to propose to a child to con-
' tend with a grown man."

We have indicated here, in few words, the principle which has always controlled the policy of the English and French nations; and the late treaty negotiated between these Pow-

ers is in accordance with it. Protect every home interest, until it has grown strong and able to take care of itself, and it may then be exposed to the competition of the world, and not before.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot very well understand why the Democratic party has, not long since, abandoned the tariff, and inaugurated direct taxation. It has often, and for long periods, possessed every branch of the Government, and might have reduced its favorite theory to practice. Are Democrats sincere in their professed devotion to this theory? Do they really believe that it would be less burdensome to the people to pay out of their pockets from sixty to one hundred millions per year in hard money to the tax-gatherers of the Government, than by a tax in the form of duties on foreign goods? If so, they have been false to their principles and recreant to their duty, in not having instituted this change.

From my boyhood, I remember to have seen in the papers, and heard from Democratic stump orators, the promise periodically made, of cheap goods, free trade, and hard money, if the dear people would only vote their party into power. Why, sir, I had expected, twenty-five years since, that the bank rags of the country would disappear in bonfires, and I had hoped, too, to share in that good time always coming, when the gold and silver would be heard to jingle in the pockets of the "hard-fisted yeomanry" of the land. But it somehow happens that nearly all of the Democratic States of the Union have found some sort of uncontrollable, unexplainable necessity for continuing the manufacture of bank rags. The masses of the party have exhibited wonderful patience in not having demanded from their leaders the ushering in of this millennium of free trade and hard money. If they are satisfied, I will not complain, though I would like to see that good time come; for I have no great love for banks or their rags, and shall hail the period when this uncontrollable Democratic necessity for their existence shall cease. So long, however, as we continue to send out of the country, as we are now doing under the present tariff, over sixty million of coin per year, to pay for goods that we ought to manufacture at home, I shall despair of ever seeing that happy period. Now, sir, if works are the test of faith, it will hardly be considered unfair to conclude that these Democratic promises of hard money and free trade, so long waiting fulfilment, are only cant phrases with which to gull the simple. I will not find fault with those who use them; like all other theories, if they possess practical value, time, and the good sense of the people, will make them available.

As practical legislators, we must take things as we find them. We have always had a tariff, and probably always will have one, at least during our day. The only question, then, for us to determine, is, whether a state of things has not been reached which will bring these opposing theorists upon the subject of the tariff to a harmony of action that will prove satisfactory to both and beneficial to the country. All admit that our present tariff, even with vastly-increased importations, does not afford sufficient revenue, and that $47,500,000 have been borrowed in the last three years, to meet the deficiency. It is equally well known, that its *ad valorem* duties and warehousing system have proved destructive to the most important manufacturing interests of the country. If, then, the increased expenditures of the Government, and the liquidation of the public debt, shall require a tariff that will afford all the protection the industrial interests of the country need, where is the difficulty in adjusting this matter? The free trader is offered, in a tariff for revenue, the compromise he is willing to make with his theory; and the protectionist gets all he wants, and should therefore be satisfied.

As to the present warehousing system, and the proposed change from *ad valorem* to specific duties, there can hardly be much difference of opinion. The manifest injustice of the former, not only to our importers and merchants, but to our manufacturers, surely demands some reform. There can be no interest of any class which can justify the Government in becoming a commission merchant for foreign manufacturers. To hire houses at high rates for the storage of their goods a whole year without charge, without the payment of duties until the goods are removed, or interest on the amount of duty, is a liberality I cannot approve, especially as it operates to the injury of my own constituents. As an example of its workings, a manufacturer from my district ships his iron to Cleveland; the price is low, the market dull, and, as he cannot sell without a loss, he stores it with the commission merchant. An English manufacturer ships his iron to the same place, finds the market bad, but thinks a year hence it may be better, and he, too, stores—but where? A custom-house officer very kindly steps forward, and says to Mr. Englishman: I will take charge of your iron, store it in a Government warehouse, keep it a year without any charge, and when the iron is removed, you can pay the duty without interest. The Ohio manufacturer pays storage and a commission to his merchant; the English manufacturer pays neither. The first must have money; and if advances can be obtained on his iron at ten and twelve per cent., he thinks himself fortunate; the latter, if he needs to borrow, gets his at three per cent. Is it any wonder that my constituent should be driven from the market by such a competition as this, or that his neighbors should sympathize with him when they know that the money which he gets for his iron is all expended among them, whilst probably nine-tenths of the Englishman's is carried out of the country in coin? Such is the operation of this law in most instances, when the imported article comes in

competition with the home manufacture. The only advantage in the system is to the foreign importer, and at the expense of the Government and our own citizens.

The gross frauds practiced upon the honest merchant and importer, and upon the Government, under the *ad valorems* of the present tariff—if there were no other objection—should induce a change to specific duties wherever practicable. The character and extent of these frauds have been exposed to the country, and to both Houses of Congress, time and again. By means of false invoices and a system of smuggling, the Government has not only been robbed of millions of revenue, but the honorable and honest importing merchant has been driven from the trade.

I will not repeat what has already been said upon this subject. The table furnished to the Committee by Mr. MORRILL should convince any one of the necessity of putting a stop to these enormous evils. In the last four years, our custom-house returns of French goods show $148,639,293, while the French returns show $286,351,972—a difference of $137,712,679. A duty of thirty per cent. on this sum exhibits a loss to the revenue of the Government of over $41,000,000 in four years on French goods alone. The difference in the duty on goods at their actual cost and the value given in the false invoice, would of itself be a handsome profit. It is not surprising, then, that the honest importer has abandoned the business to dishonest and unscrupulous men and the factors and agents of foreigners.

But, sir, there are other objections. Probably no other provision of the tariff of 1857 has inflicted greater injury upon the American manufacturer, or been so universally condemned. Mr. Webster said of *ad valorems*, when discussing the tariff of 1846:

"All the industry of the land is against it; 'the manufacturers are against it; the import-'ers are against it; the ship-owners are against 'it; no man cries, God save it; it is against 'the sentiment of the land."

This, sir, expresses the sentiment of the land now—all are against it, for all are injured by it. Indeed, a more effectual system could not be devised for breaking down our own manufactures and protecting the foreign. The duty increasing as the price of an article advances, and falling as the price declines, it necessarily happens, that when our manufacturers most need protection they have it least.

Pig iron at $40 per ton, under the present *ad valorem* duty of twenty-four per cent., would yield $9.60; at $20 per ton, a duty of $4.80. Now, it costs in my district to make a ton of pig iron, and place it on the Ohio river, the chief point of sale and shipment, all of $25. When the article is at or below this price, the manufacturer must lose money; and if, from any cause, such price should long be maintained, he must necessarily stop work. Should the price advance much beyond $25 per ton, he then has a protection which is not needed, for he is satisfied with $30 per ton, and can do well even at a less price, when provisions and labor are procured at average rates. Every manufacturing interest into which the consumption of iron enters in any one of its many forms, though not to the same extent, must be affected injuriously by these frequent fluctuations. All that is asked in the bill now before the House is a fixed duty of $6 per ton. This is only sixty-five cents per ton more than the average of the duty for the five years preceding June 30, 1857; but as a fixed duty, it guards the manufacturer against instability, and a depressed market from excessive importations.

Every farmer has felt the ill effects of frequent changes in the price of his commodities, and there are few who would not prefer the sure gain of a permanent and moderate price to the risk of greater gain by frequent fluctuations. Regularity in price and demand is of equal importance to the manufacturer; but stability in the tariff laws—which, to a great extent, control importations—is absolutely indispensable. Without such stability, all manufacturing enterprise will be checked; and those now engaged in the business must continue it in hopeless doubt and uncertainty. Let the policy be settled, and duties be made specific wherever practicable. If they should be fixed so low as to preclude the possibility of the American manufacturers competing successfully with the foreign, they can but stop work, dismantle their factories, discharge their thousands of laborers, and go into liquidation.

But, Mr. Chairman, since it is admitted that the tariff of 1857 does not give sufficient revenue to meet the wants of the Government, and that its *ad valorems* and warehouse system are ruinons to some branches of our national industry, I can but hope that we may be able to agree upon some measure better suited to the exigencies of the Government and of the country.

Though I am a protectionist of the Henry Clay school from observation and reflection, and twenty-five years teaching of that firm and consistent and able defender of American industry—the *National Intelligencer*—yet I am not disposed to quibble about the principle or the mode by which the producing and manufacturing interests of the country are secured. Whether by protection *per se*, or protection incidental, or partial free trade, it matters not. With equal pleasure will my support be given to any measure which I can feel assured will accomplish the end, and especially if it will rekindle the fires in the iron establishments of my district, and inspire confidence in the thousands who labor in them, that in the future their bread shall be sure.

The district which I have the honor to represent is deeply interested in this subject; and

I now propose, Mr. Chairman, to show how that interest arises.

Whilst one portion of the district is unsurpassed in fertility of soil and other agricultural advantages, another portion is rich in coal and iron ore. The census returns of 1850 showed the county in which I reside to be the largest food-producing county in the United States. Two other counties fall behind this one only because of the smaller proportion of farming land. Lying alongside of these rich lands were large tracts of country, which were regarded, only a few years since, as almost valueless, being too poor and broken for cultivation, and too inaccessible and distant from any outlet for mining; but, by means of railroads, these iron and coal fields have been made accessible and brought into connection with other channels of communication, that afford access to markets, East, West, North, and South. That which was worthless has thus not only become valuable in itself, but instrumental, also, in giving increased value to all other property.

In this district alone there are now thirty-five iron furnaces, thirteen founderies, five extensive rolling-mills, one nail factory, and one brass foundery; in adjoining counties there are ten other furnaces; and in Kentucky, directly opposite, there are seventeen furnaces, ten iron founderies, five rolling-mills, and one nail factory—making altogether ninety-eight iron establishments in a circuit of not over sixty miles. From statistical tables annually corrected and published, in the city of Portsmouth, I find that these sixty-two furnaces average 2,500 tons of pig iron each, making a total of 155,000 tons; which, at $30 per ton, will give the large sum of $4,650,000. The average number of hands employed in each is 100, and the wages paid $25 per month; making $1,860,000 annually paid for labor. The consumption of corn is 15,000 bushels each; which, at 50 cents, amounts to $465,000. There is expended for flour, allowing six and a half barrels to each family of five persons, at $6 per barrel, $241,800; and for bacon, beef, and pork, allowing 300 pounds to the family, at 10 cents, the sum of $186,000. The average of dry goods, groceries, hardware, queensware, and clothes, sold at each furnace, is $20,000; making the entire sales $1,240,000. If to the number of laborers employed in the sixty-two furnaces, we add those of the thirty-six other establishments, allowing only fifty men to each, we have the number of 8,000 men thus engaged in the manufacture of iron, and not less than 40,000 souls dependent upon this one interest for food and raiment. Taking the furnace statistics as a basis, we will have $124,200 to add to the sum expended for flour and meats; and estimating $100 as the outlay for each family for goods, wares, clothing, and groceries, the gross sum of $180,000 must be added to the sales of the merchant. There is, then, annually disbursed by the manufacturers of iron, in this small compass of sixty miles, for labor and farm products, and the goods and wares of the merchant, the sum of $5,306,678.

The importance of this branch of industry to that portion of the West, and especially to the farmers of my district, can be readily understood. The consumer and producer were here brought alongside of each other. A certain and safe market was established for all the products of the farm, lands increased in value, and the farmer became richer because of his proximity to the furnace. A reciprocal interest awakened a common sympathy, for the prosperity or the adversity of the one is felt by the other; and thus we see it now. A scene of animation has been changed to one of gloom. Some of these furnaces have closed up, many are on half work, and all, sooner or later, must break down under the ruinous policy of the present tariff. All alike, if not to the same extent, have felt the effect of this change; and the memorials, therefore, which have been laid upon your Clerk's table by the score, came not from the laborer and mechanic and manufacturer alone, but from the farmer and merchant and professional man, without distinction of party. They all join in petitioning Congress, not for high duties, not for protection against competition, but simply for a specific in place of an *ad valorem* duty. Give to our iron men a moderate and parmanent specific duty, and relief from the unjust discrimination against them in the present warehouse system, and they ask no more. They will prove, in less than five years, as has been done before, that under a moderate and stable tariff they will cheapen iron to the consumer. In every instance where the duty imposed on a foreign article has been such as to stimulate competition, and not destroy it, between the home and foreign manufacturer, as well as between the home manufacturers themselves, the result has been firmly to establish the manufacture and cheapen the article. But I will not go into a discussion of this, as I desire to direct attention to another branch of this subject.

We have here, Mr. Chairman, a forcible demonstration of the necessity of bringing the plow, the loom, and the anvil, together. This necessity must continue to exist, and every year become more urgent, throughout the whole of the great West. With such a vast extent of fertile soil, if fully worked, she could feed a world. But where is to be the market for her vast surplus? England will not want it, nor France, nor any other country, unless gaunt famine should cause a temporary demand. Though we have so assiduously, and at such vast expense, sought consumers for our surplus products all over the world, yet but a very small proportion finds its way out of our own country. A comparative statement, made from official records, of the exports from the United States and my own State, of agricultural products, will illustrate the value of the home mar-

ket and the worthlessness of the foreign. In the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1859, we find the following table of the exports of agricultural products:

Of Vegetables.

Wheat	$2,849,192
Flour	14,433,591
Indian corn	1,323,103
Indian meal	994,269
Rye meal	60,786
Rye, oats, and other small grain	1,181,170
Potatoes	284,111
Apples	99,803
Onions	100,669
Spirits	1,223,311
	22,550,005

Of Animals.

Beef	$2,188,056	
Tallow	712,551	
Cattle	1,345,058	
Butter	750,912	
Cheese	649,301	
Pork	3,355,746	
Hams and bacon	1,263,042	
Lard	3,268,406	
Hogs	550,875	
Wool	355,563	
Horses	290,250	
Sheep	41,182	
		14,770,942
		37,320,947

E. D. Mansfield, commissioner of statistics of Ohio, gives the following table of exports from the State, for 1858:

Flour and wheat	$11,111,518
Other grains	1,750,000
Beef and cattle	6,165,551
Pork, lard, lard oil, and hogs, deducting 300,000 for Indiana and Kentucky hogs	13,885,302
Butter, cheese, tallow, and grease	1,734,382
Whisky	5,109,953
Wool	2,649,466
Apples, eggs, oil cake, &c.	800,000
Articles manufactured from products of agriculture—candles, soap, &c.	3,000,000
Horses, 7,400	740,000
Sheep, 120,000	400,000
	46,476,172

These tables show at a glance the difference in the export of the same articles of Western farm products by the United States and the State of Ohio. They are not for the same years, one being for 1858, and the other for 1859; but I am well assured that the aggregate exports of 1859 from the State were larger than they were in 1858. And what is the fact revealed in these tables? It may appear incredible, yet it is true, that Ohio, in 1859, furnished a larger amount of such Western products as are specified in these tables than was exported from the United States. This important fact is not exhibited merely for the purpose of showing the resources of the State of Ohio, or to make the impression that the exports of provisions from the United States had not heretofore or may not again exceed that of 1859. In 1858, over fifty million dollars in food were exported, and in 1856 and 1857 over seventy millions; but these facts only go to show that the foreign market is uncertain as well as insufficient.

But I add further, in illustration. The whole amount of wheat and flour, reducing the latter to bushels, exported from this country in 1859, was less than 5,500,000; whilst Buffalo, one of our Lake towns, forwarded eastward, in the same year, 16,319,779, and of other grains 5,144,527 bushels. And this year, too, exhibits a falling off from the shipments of former years, in consequence of diversion to other routes, of some 15,000,000 bushels. Still, this one port on an interior lake forwarded for Western farmers to an Eastern market more than three times as much grain as was exported by the United States. The entire commerce of the United States, including exports and imports, is something over $650,500,000; whilst that of our Northern lakes alone is probably over $400,000,000; and the internal trade of all the States not less than $8,000,000,000. In a most elaborate report made by Mr. Andrews to the Secretary of the Treasury, in 1852, the internal trade of the United States was estimated at $5,000,000,000; it has greatly increased since that time, and doubtless reached the above enormous sum. But why multiply examples? The entire statistics of the country exhibit the disparity between the production and the foreign export of Western products. Ohio is but a small part of the great West, and Buffalo is only one of the many forwarding points on the numerous lines of transport for Western produce. Western Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan, are all alike prolific, and have a vast surplus to be disposed of. Where does it go. Who consumes it? The cotton and sugar planters of the South take a part, but much the larger part is consumed in the Northern and Eastern States, in the large cities, in the manufactories and in the whaling and fishing vessels of New England.

It must be evident to every sane man, that it is perfectly chimerical to think of finding abroad a market for the immense surplus of the grain-growing and stock-raising States of the West. Our surest and best and only market is at home; and whenever you break down the manufacturing interests of the country, by unjust discriminations against them, through your tariff laws, you also cripple its

agriculture, and impoverish every farmer in the land. Our Western farmers and business men are eminently practical. They analyze theories, test systems of policy and the operations of law, by a common-sense scrutiny, that is not easily deceived. Practical demonstration is with them the true test of all theories. And in this way they have learned that they sell highest when they sell at home, and buy cheapest where they can pay easiest. A few years since, large quantities of corn were shipped from my district to Eastern distilleries and starch factories. The price was rarely over twenty-five cents, and oftener under that. Now, not a bushel is shipped. Why? Because iron manufactories, starch factories, and distilleries, have been erected at our own doors, and consume all, and more than all, the surplus of our farmers. The price now is rarely under forty cents, and during the last two years has averaged sixty cents per bushel. This is a demonstration easily understood. He must be a dull man, who cannot see that the aggregate wealth of this region is greatly increased by the change, and that the mechanic, and laborer, and tradesman, and farmer, are all alike benefited. Instead of destroying these manufacturing establishments, and going back to the old system of exporting our products, every farmer would hail with as much pleasure as any other citizen the erection of other factories in every town and village of the district. All would expect to see flow from them increased wealth and prosperity; for such are always the results of bringing the consumer and producer near to each other.

It will not do, at least in my district, to tell our farmers that the foreign is better than the home market. It will not do to cry out against the oppressions of the tariff, to denounce it as a device to enrich a few large manufacturers at the expense of the million, and to descant upon the beauties and blessings of free trade and direct taxation. They understand, very well, that free trade means British monopoly, and direct taxation putting your hand into your pocket and paying taxes to the General Government in gold and silver. As Ohio would have about one-tenth of the eighty or one hundred million dollars to pay of the expenses of the General Government, the already onerous tax of the people in that State would be doubled. This the farmer would feel. Duties upon imports he does not feel. Nor is he likely to be disturbed by the sympathy of the demagogue, nor to feel his burdens any the greater, even if you could convince him that all "duties are a tax on the consumer," when he knows that every product of his farm has increased in price, whilst all that he buys has fallen in price. Nor will he complain of New England manufacturers for furnishing him cotton cloth at eight and one third cents a yard, when he remembers that, only a few years since, an inferior article, of English make, cost him twenty-five cents. Nor will he, for the sake of cheaper sugar and cheaper coffee, be drawn into filibustering enterprises, or the expenditure of $300,000,000 for the purchase of Cuba. He can have no jealousy of his Louisiana neighbor, no desire to deprive him of fair profits upon his labor, when he knows that one bushel of wheat will now buy four pounds more of sugar and five pounds more of coffee than it would thirty years ago.

Experience, Mr. Chairman, has taught the people I represent here to believe that, in the sure progress of honest industry, and under a governmental policy that fosters alike every department of labor, their independence and prosperity, as well as that of the whole country, will be best secured and perpetuated.

The want of markets, or of facilities for reaching them, for many years retarded the progress of the West. Though possessing an invigorating climate, abundance of cheap land, and a soil that yielded bountiful returns to the labor and care of the husbandman, yet, in the absence of demand, there could be no encouragement to the production of a large surplus. But, in the last few years, miracles of change have been wrought by the energy and will of an enterprising people. By taxing themselves to the extent of hundreds of millions, and entailing upon their posterity liabilities for millions more, they have opened up channels of communication to every point where markets were to be found. Little aid was asked from the Government; less was received. Her sympathy and money and efforts were directed to another quarter. Harbors and light-houses and custom houses have drawn from her coffers millions upon millions. Our navy, at a cost of ten to twelve million per annum, has been chiefly employed in protecting an indifferent commerce in distant seas, searching for markets among half-civilized nations or savage islands, and carrying back and forth ministers and commissioners and consuls and commercial agents, to different points on the globe, at many of which the entire purchases and sales would not pay the officers' salaries.

Now, sir, this may all be right—we do not complain of it; but we do protest against the doctrine that it is *constitutional* to spend millions on external commerce, and not a cent on internal commerce. We must complain that, when we ask for a small pittance for the removal of obstructions to the navigation of our Northern lakes or Western rivers, or when protection to life or the necessities of an increased commerce prompt us to apply for aid to improve the harbors of such ports as Chicago, Oswego, and Buffalo—second only in importance to Boston, New York, and New Orleans—we should be met with a refusal, under the miserable pretence of unconstitutionality. We must complain that the markets created for our surplus products by the enterprise and capital of our own citizens, and which we have made

accessible by our own unaided energies, should be taken from us by an unjust policy of the Government. She cannot provide us any others. She cannot force any people to buy our bread, when they have enough of their own. Her power cannot shield us from the payment to England of our debt of $500,000,000 in California gold, when our pork and beef and flour are not wanted. She can, however, leave us these markets, and protect us in their enjoyment. Justice demands—the design of Government, which is "to promote the general welfare," demands—that all legislation should be directed to the greatest good of the greatest number. We are a nation of laborers; and that policy which shall best secure the interest of labor—our own labor—and promote the prosperity and happiness of the whole people, should be adopted, and steadily maintained.

In the West, we seek not protection for our commodities so much as protection to our markets. Our corn and beef and pork need no protection, for there can be no competition. Our wool and breadstuffs—like the hemp and tobacco and sugar of the South—are great interests, giving wealth and power and independence to the nation, and should therefore be fostered. Cotton, the great staple of the South, by the judicious protection of the Government during the first thirty or forty years of its cultivation, has become the great staple of the world. It fears no rival, asks no protection, and seeks no market, for that is already secured. All races and nations on the globe are its consumers, and to most of them it is an absolute necessity. The supply is not likely ever to exceed the demand, or a substitute to be found for it. The cotton States must therefore continue to furnish a market for the grain-producing and stock-raising States; and they, in turn, continue to be the largest consumers of their staple. And if the manufacture of cotton in the Middle and Northern States, under a stable and moderate tariff, can be made to keep pace with its increased production, both the demand for this great staple and the surplus food of the West must necessarily increase. There should be no collision of sections here; the harmony of interests is perfect, and the prosperity of any one may be made to promote the well-being of the others. What objection can there be to this just and natural agreement between labor differently applied? What argument to show that a bond of common interest, by which a kind Providence has united the men of a common country, should be sundered?

Break down, if you please, every cotton factory in the land; and what follows? You throw upon the English market nine hundred thousand bales of cotton more than are now purchased. Time is needed to build factories, get up machinery, to procure the labor, and hunt up and arrange with customers previously supplied by the American manufacturer. Will not a glutted market, during the four or five years required for these changes, depreciate the price of the article? And the largest competitor for his staple being now driven from the market, will not the planter find himself at the mercy of a British monopoly, and the reward of his labor controlled by the will and caprice of a selfish Power? What else happens? The manufacturers, and more than a hundred thousand laborers, are driven to seek employment for their capital and food for their families chiefly in agriculture, thus increasing the vast surplus of the West, of which they had been consumers. Could such a state of things be beneficial to any one of these parties? Reason says, no. And yet this has been too much the tendency of our legislation during the last few years. By our aid, England has become the great cotton manufacturer of the world; and one of the chief sources of her wealth and power is this monopoly, which our folly has given her. Her cheap labor, abundant capital, low rates of interest, experienced artisans, perfect machinery, and long experience as a manufacturing nation, gave her every advantage; still it is very certain, judging from what we have done, that if a fair protective policy had been adopted, and steadily adhered to from the beginning, more than one-half of our cotton crop would now be worked up in our own mills. And in the South itself, where the experiment has already shown that cotton factories can be worked as profitably as anywhere else, the water power upon her streams would have been made instrumental in increasing her own wealth and independence, and that of the whole country. The West would have shared in the general prosperity resulting from such a policy, in the certain and increased supplies required from her surplus. It is not too late yet to inaugurate a system that will so surely develop our resources, and bring wealth and prosperity to the country. A more favorable period than the present cannot occur. The Government wants more revenue; a few of the industrial interests of the country need protection, and all demand a stable policy. May it be our pleasure, as it is our duty, to meet the exigency by some measure of relief that will prove to be wise and just.

—o—

Published by the Republican Congressional Committee. Price 50 cents per hundred.